

The Honorable Marsha J. Pechman

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

IN RE WASHINGTON MUTUAL, INC.
SECURITIES, DERIVATIVE & ERISA
LITIGATION

No. 2:08-md-1919 MJP

IN RE WASHINGTON MUTUAL, INC.
SECURITIES LITIGATION

Lead Case No. C08-0387 MJP

This Document Relates to:

Sweet v. Killinger, No. C09-1718-MJP

**PLAINTIFFS' REPLY IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION TO REMAND**

I. Introduction

The Court should grant Plaintiffs' Motion to Remand this shareholder direct
action to Lane County, Oregon Circuit Court. Equitable factors – most importantly the

///

///

///

1 Oregon-centric nature of the case that distinguishes it from the other consolidated
 2 cases – weigh in favor of remand on equitable grounds.¹

3 **II. Equitable Remand is Appropriate for this Oregon-Centered Shareholder**
 4 **Direct Action**

5 Plaintiffs recognize that the Court found equitable remand inappropriate in the
 6 Solton and Ventura matters, but believes that Plaintiffs' factual allegations in this action
 7 are distinguishable and weigh in favor of equitable remand. The key factor, glossed
 8 over by Defendants in their opposition brief, is that this shareholder direct action is
 9 Oregon-centered. Although this case shares with the consolidated cases some
 10 common allegations of wrongdoings by Washington Mutual officers and directors in
 11 terms of publicly released information, those allegations set the table for the ultimate
 12 misrepresentations that targeted Plaintiffs on an individual and/or group basis.
 13 Complaint, ¶¶ 98-99, 104-107.

14 Actions that ultimately convinced Plaintiffs to hold what would soon become
 15 worthless shares of that same stock occurred in Oregon. Discovery in this case will
 16 necessarily focus on communications between: (1) Defendants and the local Oregon
 17 Washington Mutual branch employees and offices ; and (2) communications between
 18 the local Oregon Washington Mutual branch employees and offices and Plaintiffs.
 19 Oregon law, moreover, and not the federal securities laws that are the focus of the
 20 consolidated actions, will govern this case.

21 ///

22 _____

23 ¹ The Court previously ruled on the "related to" jurisdiction issue, so Plaintiffs do
 24 not address that issue in this Reply.

1 This factor, combined with the other factors weighing in favor of remand as set
2 forth in Plaintiff's motion, weigh in favor of remand on equitable grounds.

3 **III. Conclusion**

4 For the reasons set forth in Plaintiff's motion to remand and the reasons set forth
5 above, the Court should remand this action to Lane County, Oregon Circuit Court.
6

7 DATED this 13th day of January, 2010.

8 STEWART SOKOL & GRAY, LLC

9 By: s/ Thomas A. Larkin

10 John Spencer Stewart, WSBA # 15887
11 Thomas A. Larkin, WSBA # 24515
12 2300 SW First Avenue, Suite 200
13 Portland, OR 97201-5047
14 Email: jstewart@lawssg.com
Email: tlarkin@lawssg.com
Telephone: (503) 221-0699
Facsimile: (503) 223-5706

15 Walter B. Hogan, *Pro Hac Vice*
16 *Admission to be Submitted*
17 706 Ash Street
18 P. O. Box 458
19 Myrtle Point, Oregon 97458
20 Email: whogan@aol.com
Telephone: (541) 572-4060
Facsimile: (541) 572-4401

21 Of Attorneys for Plaintiffs
22
23
24
25
26

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on January 13, 2010, the foregoing was electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to all counsel of record who receive CM/ECF notification, and that the remaining parties shall be served in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

DATED this 13th day of January, 2010.

STEWART SOKOL & GRAY LLC

By: s/ Thomas A. Larkin
Thomas A. Larkin, WSBA 24515
2300 SW First Avenue, Suite 200
Portland, OR 97201-5047
Telephone: (503) 221-0699
Fax: (503) 223-5706
Email: jstewart@lawssg.com